

*Survey*

Reference

Morgenstierne, Georg. 1947. Some features of Khowar morphology. Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap 14.5-28.

*You may keep this copy.*

From: Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap.  
Bd. 14 (Oslo 1947)

## SOME FEATURES OF KHOWAR MORPHOLOGY

by

GEORGE MORGFAXTHURST

Khawar is an Indo-Aryan, Dardic, language spoken in Chitral, a hill-state which occupies the north-westernmost corner of the Indian Empire. The country is wild and rugged in the extreme, and only small patches of fertile, cultivated ground are scattered about in the narrow valleys, which appear as mere fissures in the mass of mountains, rising to about 7800 metres in the imposing peak of Terich Mir. In spite of the high altitude of the Hindu Kush passes Chitral has from ancient times been in lively communication with the Iranian-speaking valleys in Badakhshan and the Pamirs. To the east Khawar overflows into the upper part of the Gilgit valley, where it is in contact with Indo-Aryan Shina and the Warchikwar dialect of Burushaski. In recent times Pashto has conquered the territory south of Chitral, but in some localities ancient Dardic dialects are still spoken. To the west Khawar borders upon the Kafir language Kati, which is also found in some settlements within the borders of Chitral. Kalasha, another Dardic tongue, formerly occupied the greater part of southern Chitral, but has now been pushed back into the western side-valleys. Some other minor dialects, Iranian and Dardic, are spoken in various places in Chitral, but Khawar is the main language of the state, and the number of its speakers may approach to 100 000.

~~Khawar has no written literature, but its prestige as being the official language of the state and the aristocratic character of Chitrali society have led to the stabilization of a comparatively homogeneous norm. There are no well-defined dialects, perhaps partly because the peasants are frequently being transferred from one part of the state to another by the big landowners.<sup>1</sup>~~

<sup>1</sup> Cf., e.g. Khawar, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, pp. 69, sqq., and Rep. on a Lingu. Miss. to N. W. India, pp. 46, sqq.

According to Sir George Grierson's well-known theory the Dardic languages, among which he includes also the Kafiri group, form a special branch of Indo-Iranian. And he considers Khowar, as occupying an independent position within Dardic: "The Kafir and Dard (Eastern Dardic) groups are much more nearly related to each other than either is to Khōwar. On the other hand Khōwar shows traces of connection with the Ghalehah languages (= Iranian Pamir languages) spoken north of the Pamirs which are wanting in the other two groups. It thus resembles a somewhat alien wedge inserted between the other two groups and thrusting them apart, coming into the country subsequently to the other two and after it had developed some of the Ghalehah characteristics<sup>1</sup>."

I am unable to share these views. The Dardic languages, in contradistinction to the true Kafir group<sup>2</sup>, are of pure IA origin and go back to a form of speech closely resembling Vedic. This state of affairs cannot be altered by the fact that Dardic has preserved many archaisms lost in later IA languages, nor by the wide-spread loss of aspiration.

As regards Khōwar it must be admitted that its vocabulary contains a large percentage of words which cannot be traced back to IA. A fair number of them are Ir. loan-words of various age<sup>3</sup>, and so far Grierson is justified in assuming a strong influence upon Khōwar from the languages beyond the Hindu Kush. A group of words are shared with Burushaski and Shina, but a great number of the most common terms are of unknown origin. Thus, e. g., *γēē* eye; *ap'ak* mouth; *krem* back; *čamoth* finger; *iski* heel; *askār* lungs, and several other names of parts of the body.

It is also possible that the loss of gender and the formation of the numerals 11—19 (ten + one, etc.) in Khōw. (and Kalasha) may have some connection with parallel phenomena in neighbouring Ir. languages, such as Yidgha and Wakhi. The loss of gender cannot

<sup>1</sup> I.S.I. I, 1, p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Indo-Eur. *k* in Kafiri, NTS, XII, pp. 225, 299.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Iranian Elements in Khōwar, BSOS, VIII, pp. 675, 599.

<sup>4</sup> But *sth* > *th*: *thūn* post, pillar; *thūf* fat; poss. *duwath* door < \**duwdrastha*. Cf. Aśoka, Shahbazgarhi *astī* is, but *gruhatha* householder.

<sup>5</sup> Shahbazg. *śuta* heard. — Note, however, Khōw. *suung* horn, with *s* from Ir.?

be ascribed to the elision of final vowels, which is common to most modern IA languages. In the great majority of cases the category of gender has been saved by the employment of enlarged stems in *-ka*, *-ki*, and the same way might have been open to Khowar.

The general structure of Khow. is, however, purely IA, and several archaic features have been retained in its phonology. Thus we not only find *st* (*host* hand; *istari* star; *istri* female)<sup>4</sup>; *sr*, *sr*, *sm*, *sm* > *sp*, *šp*, *sp*, *sp* (*spasār* sister; *īspašar* father-in-law; *īspa* we; *grīsp* summer), but also *śr* (*śāśra* tear; *śron* hip)<sup>5</sup>; *rt* and *rd* (*hort* stone; *thūrt* food; *birtd* having died; *harārd* heart)<sup>6</sup>; *\*t* > *\*ḍ* > *\*r*<sup>7</sup> (*brar* brother; *ī-porn* white; *porik* to fall, to fall asleep; *arti* satisfied < *\*ariti* < *\*a-tiphka-v*); *\*g* > *\*r*; *ūr* water; *ulaka*; *rōp* doudar < *rōka*; *uqār* castle. A remarkable form is *dhong* bag, apparently *\*dhong* < *\*dhongha*; cf. Lat. *longus*, etc. *\*dhonghos*.

But the most striking feature of Khow. is its remarkable inflectional archaisms, and a short survey of some elements of its morphology may perhaps be of some interest to readers outside the narrow circle of specialists in modern IA linguistics. A more complete grammar will be published later on, and here I shall only endeavour to draw attention to the main outlines of the morphological system<sup>8</sup>.

Nearly all modern IA languages have greatly reduced the inflectional distinction between ancient noun-stems, and only in a few, such as Kashmiri and Sindhi, do we find more extensive traces of the original system. In Khow. the inflection of the ancient bases in *a* has prevailed upon all other stems, probably in connection with the loss of the category of gender. Apart from the secondary difference of inflection between animate and inanimate nouns the only irregularity appearing in the paradigms of nouns is the use of some special plural suffixes, the loss of final *u* and the syncope of svarabhakti-vowels before case-suffixes.

<sup>4</sup> Assimilation of *r* takes place only before a cerebral *ɣ*: *boɣk* to rain; cf. Shabbazg. *caɣa* year. — *R* before *t* is voiceless, and is written *hr* in the GP.

Cf. S. Kalasha *sr*; N. Kal. *sm* (gen. *ślas*) bridge < *\*sed* < Khow. *ser*.

<sup>5</sup> The descriptions of Khow. morphology given in the ISI, by Biddulph (Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh), and by O'Brien (Gramm. and Voc. of the Khowar Dialect) are not complete or accurate in all particulars.

In the great majority of modern IA languages the ancient case-system has been radically reduced, and nothing more than debris remain. Only in the North-West do we find more extensive traces of the original inflection of nouns. Thus in Sindhi (e. g. *dehu* nom. village; *-a* obl., voc.; *-ā* abl.), Kashmiri (e. g. *čor* thief; *-as* dat.; *-an* ag.; *-a* abl.; *-i* loc.), and Pashai (Langowān dialect *puṛ* son; *putra* obl.; *-as* gen.; *-āi* dat., and in inanimate nouns *-ai* abl.).

But Khowar stands alone in retaining, in the inflection of inanimate nouns, six of the seven Old IA cases<sup>1</sup>: Nom. (with some traces of a special treatment of the acc.), gen., dat., loc., instr., and abl.

1. The Khow. **nom.** or *casis rectus*, is used (1) as a subject and (2) as an indefinite object<sup>2</sup>. E. g., *n'an tan z'awo te čonfor g'aplat*<sup>3</sup> the mother [her] own son-for a pellet-bow seized; *ma isfusāro dur šer* it is my sister's house; *i khāi sūi* having sewn a cap; *iškār areni* they hunted; *iškār ba,ai* he went hunting.

3). It is also used about time (indefinite), e. g., *i anus* one day; *i sal toyo zo bo hoi* GP one year his [crop of] grain was good (it became much); *grīsp yomun tu sorar pair pušār no zibos* GP summer and winter thou never eatest any meat but head.

In the GP the nom. of a noun denoting time is combined with the obl. of a demonstrative pronoun, e. g., in *hata anus di heč kyaraš no hoi* that day too nothing happened. Thus three combinations are possible: *ha-e-a anus* that day (nom. + nom.); *hate/a anus* (obl. + nom.) and *hate a anuso* (obl. + obl.). Historically the type *hate anus* goes back to *tap divasam* (or *tasmin divaset*), and also synchronically *hase anus* and *hate anus* may be said to represent, as a group, two different cases.

<sup>1</sup> Reg. the Voc. v. p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> As Khow. has preserved the ancient active preterite, the subject of a transitive verb in the past is also put in the nom., not in the oblique, as is the case in most other Modern IA languages where the construction is passive. The subject of the past pte. in *-in*, when used as a finite verb, is, however, in some instances put in the obl. gen.: *Bapo rādu* the old man said; *daryaho aldu* the river carried it away.

<sup>3</sup> The examples are partly taken from my own Khow. texts and partly from Khan Sahib Abdul Hakim Khan's useful Translation of the Ganj-i-Pukhto

4). In *faya bačen* (GP *pacin*) 'on account of this' the postposition *bačen* is combined with the nom., not with the obl. of the pronoun. The historical explanation possibly is that this expression originally meant 'on this account', with regular, uninflected pronominal adjective.<sup>4</sup>

5). Finally the nom. is employed with the postposition *to/tu* into: *Dār to utāi* he entered the house; *kān tu usi* having climbed up into the tree; *angar tu lakhitam* I put it into the fire. *To* is possibly derived from Skt. *antāḥ* 'within' (with the loc.), with early loss of the initial vowel in an accessory word.

The nom. obviously goes back to the Skt. nom., acc. in *-ah*, *-am* etc. It is also possible that in some cases it may represent an ancient locative in *-e*.

Obligat

11. The Khowar [obl.] ends in *-o*. Words in short *-u* drop it before *-o*, thus *kumōro* girl, obl. of *kumōru*, but *aesao* arrow, from *aeṣu*.<sup>5</sup> A svarabhakti vowel is elided in *kormo* work, obl. *korum*, etc., and *-ā + o* is sometimes contracted into *-o*, e. g., *ṣāḍṣato*, GP *ṣāḍṣo* king, from *ṣāḍṣa(h)*; *hamyānō* purse, from *hamyāna*.

The obl. is used:

1. As a genitive: *Hate m'aso sor* that man's head; *guc'eno m'ena* in the middle of the garden; *bio buḍuki* GP a seed-bag; *kanduri wāyo lāyq šer* of what value is it? *čhiniko layeq no asoi* it ought not to be crushed (lit.: it was not worth crushing).

2. As a definite object: *Hosto drungētai* he stretched out his hand; *khāyo sūtai* she sewed the cap; *ta ṣapiko no žibom* I shall not eat thy bread (but *ṣapik awa tan žibom* I shall eat my own bread); *hata lyuo mū te det, walikin hoisk lyu det* GP tell it me, but tell the truth, lit.: give me that word, but give me a true word; *žibiko boi*

into the Khowar dialect, Calc. 1902 (abbrev. GP), a book not mentioned in the bibliography of Khowar given in the LSI. -- The transcription of my own texts have in some cases been slightly regularized. The phonological value of quantity is often doubtful, except, usually, in the case of *ā : u*. -- GP does not distinguish *g*, *c* from *ž*, *č*.

<sup>4</sup> V. below, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Final *-u* < *-akā*, *-ū* < *-ukā*. But note *q* in *ūy* water < *uḥko*; *šlōy* tale < *šlōka*, *buṣuq* walnut < *amrakā*, etc.

he can eat it. The distinction between definite and indefinite object is common to many IA and Ir. languages.

(3.) About local relations, denoting a movement towards or into: *Awa hamoş kormo bīm-an* I am going for such a work; *tan duro hai* he came to his own house; *haya hamyānō* (acc.) *haya reşūo* (gen.) *gōlo* (illat.) *dōm* GP I shall put this purse into this bull's throat; *ta ēheho pēhūmi* they throw thee into the well. — Note *haya ēheho hasa šēr asur* GP the tiger is inside this well.

(4.) Temporally *I anuso* one day (used by some speakers of Khaw. i *anus*); *chūyo hāl bōs* stay [here] for the night; *oşto anuso* on the eighth day; *ēhuo . . . anuso* GP by night . . . by day.

5. Adverbially: *Wēzen biko* when evening came; *the we-keḥko di roo xoşān koriko hoi* and he can also without tears (lit.: weeping) make a man happy.

(6.) In the plur. as a vocative: *Ēi brārginiān* O brothers; *ē yārānan* GP friends. — In the sing. the nom. with *t(i)* is used as a voc.: *ēi nan* or *nan-ē* O mother.

(7.) As a base for most postpositions and nouns functioning as postpositions. E. g.:

a) *Te* (dial. *ten*) to, for: *Hate weşwo anzītai tan brāro te* he sent the arrow to his (own) brother; *tan xuş boko te prai* he gave it to his beloved wife; *moşo te rētai* she said to her husband; *işkaro te* ( = *işkār*) *baṛai* he went hunting; *duwartho te hai* he came to the door; *wēzeno te dura bi* having gone home in (towards) the evening.<sup>1</sup>

b) *Sar* from: *I moşo sar başar arer* GP he asked (from) the man; *tan pādšō sar xabar gaṇim* I shall get news [about it] from my king; *hate wano sar ai aḥtai* a snake was born from that old woman; *haya moş he moşo sar jam* this man [is] better than that man.

c) *Sum* (dial. *sū*) with: *Xalano sum baṛai* GP he went off with the mouse; *nano sū* together with his mother; *mā sum choi rupaya šeni* GP I have (lit.: there are with me) three rupees. — Skt. *samam*.

d) *Nasa* near: *Faqiro nasa toritai* he arrived near the faqir. — Cf. *nasār* from (the proximity of); O'Brien *nasina* around; *nast* in front of < Skt. *nāsā-*, *nasta(ka)-* nose?

<sup>1</sup> *Artham* might have resulted in *\*(r)thai*, but scarcely in *t(i)*. — Cf. *untake*?

e) *Gōna* near, close to: *Noṛoro gōna* near the castle, *hate učo gōna i još šer* there is a [patch of] grass near that spring.

f) *Ačha* after: *Awa bim-an wēšaw ačha* I am going after (for) the arrow. Skt. *paścat*, in sandhi > \**vačha*, and, with further reduction in an accessory word, *ačha*?

g) *Bač(n)*, GP *pač(n)* for the sake of. *Kormo bač(n)* on account of the work. Acc. to Bloch (L'indo-aryen, p. 173) < *pakṣya*, but we should then have expected \**bač(n)*.

h) *Sora* (from *sor* head)<sup>2</sup> on, etc.: *Tan kapalo sora lakhitai* he placed it on his head; *toṛo haqṛ ma sora šer* he has a right upon me; *mā sora zōṛawar asur* GP he is stronger than I am; *bo qahro sora duro te haṛai* GP he came to the house in great anger; *hawa mōš fando sora ma tan dura angifi* . . . this man, having brought me to his house by deceit, . . .

i) *Muži* between; *mužār* out of. — *Iskimān muži* in (the middle of) the silk (obl. pl.); *tan žindo mužār nēitai* he took it out of his coat.

Several other nouns are also used as postpositions.

The following cases are, with rare exceptions, formed only from inanimate nouns. They are all of a local nature, and it was therefore natural that they should be used especially with regard to nouns denoting inanimate objects and places. Also in Pashai the abl. is found only with inanimate nouns. In Khowar this tendency has been carried through completely, and has resulted in an inflectional distinction between animate and inanimate nouns. This distinction appears also in the formation of the plural, and has been strengthened by the restriction of *asur* 'is' to animate subjects, while the corresponding form with inanimate subjects is *šer* < *šete*.

With animate nouns the local relations are expressed by means of the postpositions *nasa*, *sum*, *sar*, etc. A few cases have, however, been noted of *sar* and *sum* in combination with inanimate nouns (*durdānō sar* GP from the pearl; *burdūiko sum* with the bag).

The case-suffix *-a* probably goes back to Apabhraṃśa *-ahā* or a similar form derived from Skt. *-asya*, with special reduction in

<sup>2</sup> But *sora* as an independent noun, e. g., in *tan sora wēṛo drem* I shall pour the water at (over) my head. — *Sor* is a L.W. from Ir.



a termination. In the monosyllabic *kos*, obl. of *kā* 'who', the fuller form has been retained<sup>1</sup>.

III. **First Locative** ('Allative'?) in *-a*.

1. In many, perhaps in most cases, it denotes a movement towards, or an arrival at a place. E. g., *hate gur'ena boye* go to that garden (cf. *gur'enu te boye* go towards) the garden); *gur'enu te bay'ai*, *gur'enu totitai* he went towards the garden and arrived at the garden; *hate nopord totitani* they arrived at the castle; *soto dura utai* he entered the seventh house; *Paxta mis'tai* he sat down on the throne; *husa kati* he came to his senses; *p'ayo kap'alo tan kap'ala Pakhi'om* I put the goat's head on my own head; *balaha parir* GP he will fall into misfortune; *ehinika prai* he began flit., he gave, struck to break.

2. But it is frequently used as an 'adessive' or 'inessive'. *P'oma i dū sar'ai* there was a house on the road; *p'oma ki bay'au* when thou hast gone on the road; *d'teo hosta bandi a-suni* they are prisoners in the div's hands; *d'uro sar'ana chat as'oi* in the courtyard of the house there was a pond; *i bur'd'ūikia of'm h'ate w'ouo te pr'ai* he gave the old woman millet in a bag; *tan hardia fikr arer* GP he thought in his heart; *darbina lolitai* he looked through the field-glasses.

Temporally: *H'ezena* in the evening (but *w'ezeno te* in, towards the evening); *har w'ezena* every evening (but also *har amustot* every day); *bisr lāra* GP twenty times. Adverbially: *Hate sababa* for this reason; *haya qisma* GP in this manner.

3. As a base for the postposition *pat* until: *Ma durār tan dura pat* from my house to his own house; *yār dika pat* until sunrise; *tā granīša pat* LSI until midday; *serār gani ponga pat* GP (having taken) from head to foot.

Khov. *-a* < *ā* goes back, through Apabhramśa *-ā*, to Skt. dat. *-āya*. Cf. Skt. *grāmāya gacchati* he goes to the village. It is very remarkable that the dat., which had already been weakened in Skt., and which disappears altogether within the course of Middle IA develop-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e. g. Nep. *-āhā* > *-āhi*, but *kos*; Central Asiatic Kharoṣṭhi Inscr. *-āya* (cf. *-āzā*), but *yasya*. V. Turner, The phonetic weakness of terminational elements in Indo-Aryan, JRAS, 1927, p. 232 sq.

ment, should have been retained as a case fully alive in Khowar. But phonetically no other derivation seems possible, and it is very improbable that *-a* should be a secondary, postpositional element. Also in Pashai of Lajpawan the dat. (in *-āi*) has been preserved, but only with animate nouns and as an indirect object. In Khowar, on the other hand, the use of the ancient oblique cases, with the exception of the genitive, has been restricted to inanimate nouns and local relations.

**IV. Second Locative** in *-i*. This case is used as well with verbs of movement as with verbs denoting staying or resting in a place, and in very many cases it is impossible to detect any different shade of meaning between expressions with *-a* and with *-i*. Thus either case may be used with *as-* to be (in); *bik* to go (to); *gik* to come (to); *torik* to reach.

1. As an allative: *Toyo duri bayai* he went to his house (but *tan dura bayai* he went to his own house); *ahe duri hai* he came back home (*dura giti* having come to the house); *ispa hosti ki goi* when he came into our hands; *mehi no tarir-an* it does not reach the waist (*noyora toritai* he reached the castle); *bilopi pchitani* they put it into a niche; *xatani lolitani* they looked into the room.

2. As an inessive or adessive: *Haya duri ser* it is in this house; *duri ser* LSI, Sent. 226 (but Sent. 223 *ta tato dura* in thy father's house); *ta duri bas bōm* I shall spend the night in thy house; *mā hardii ser* GP I think (lit. it is in my heart); *mehi hoti asur* GP he is bound at the waist; *tan muži lā dirū* they spoke amongst themselves; *šimēni mā mehi* the rope [is] round my waist. — Temporally: *Anusi* daily.

This locative in *-i* cannot be derived from Skt. *-e*, which would have been lost<sup>2</sup>, but must go back to Apabhraṃśa *-ahim*, O. Singh. *-ahi*, etc. < *-asmin*. Regarding the phonetical development cf. Turner, loc. cit., p. 230.

In Skt. the loc. denotes as well 'the spot where' as 'the spot whither'<sup>3</sup>. In the latter function it overlaps with that of the dat., and

<sup>2</sup> For traces of Skt. loc. in *-e* v. above, nominative, I, 31, 51.

<sup>3</sup> Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 133.

this may have been the starting point for the Khowar extension of the use of the dat. as an ad- and inessive.

**V. Instrumental** in *-en* (poetically in one case *-ene*).

1. Instrument: *Bardoxen, borten, banen dik* to strike with an axe, a stone, a stick; *ye'en pošitai* GP he saw with his eye; *ke pušāren tan soro ahrtyēs* GP that thou mayest gorge (satisfy) thyself on [her] flesh.

2. Cause: *Ušakien dēir* it will be frost-bitten by cold; *buhrtumen tēz dēstai* GP it ran off with haste from fear; *čhu'en bryām-an* GP I am dying of hunger.

3. Reference to: *I ye'en kamu* blind on one eye.

4. Locally: *Bo'e ponen* go along the road; *haya ponen mo geh* GP don't come along this road; *Kašalagaken bisi* LSI we shall go by way of Kašalagak; *hate baxen yōr dūro toritai* the sun reached the house through this hole; *jangala* (sic!) *ōē anen oē dāsten oē beyābānen kosan ošoi* GP he was wandering through forests, over hills and plains and through deserts. -- Cf. Skt. *mārgēṇa gacchati*.

5. Temporally: *Chu'en* by night; *urti anusen* (by) the next day. Khow. *-en* = Skt. *-ena*. — The use of the incidentally similar obl. in *-en* in Yidgha *mīxen* by day, etc., is probably due to the influence of the adjoining and dominating Khowar.

**IV. Ablative** in *-ār*<sup>1</sup>. The abl. is used:

1. Locally (and as a partitive): *Tan duār bayar* he went away from his house; *hostār hosti* GP from hand to hand; *ormār ruḥitai* he rose from sleep; *bandār xalus* GP released from prison (but *mo sār xolās* released from him), *uḡar ma te pūār* let me drink from (of) the water; *chirār tan mano te prai* he gave his mother of the milk.

2. Temporally: *ju bišir basār ačhu* after forty days; *amusār anus* GP day by day; *troi bas ačhār* GP after three days; *bo janjalār ačhār* GP after much quarrelling.

3. Causally: *He duro urikār pēšmān bōs* thou wilt be regretful from opening that door; *ōyān brikār ta te kya sūd no bōi* there will be no advantage to thee from the death of the people.

<sup>1</sup> One of my informants used also the form *an*. Cf. Bodulph, Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh, p. 68 on a song: *tanari* from [his] body.

4. In comparisons: *Ḥaya mōṣār ẓair xār mōṣ* GP<sup>4</sup> another man than this man; *soār puṣār* GP other meat than head; *hamār zyāt* GP more than this; *hateẓār di jam hoi* it became still [more] beautiful [than that].

Khovar -ār < Pkt. -ato<sup>5</sup>.

Plural. -- All inanimates and many animate nouns have no suffix in the nom. plur. E. g.: *Ḥort toṛo biṭi aṣoni* the stones were in his lap; *tā host ranzury-an* GP thy hands are shaking; *paṛadār asitani* there were watchmen; *ḡay toṛo te rētani* the boys said to him; *rēni rayistani* GP the dogs barked; *Ḥindustani haṛan homi* GP the Hindustanis were astonished; *ist'ār asuni a?* are they horses? *hayara aṣdār asuni* there are dragons here; *baik mari alai* he killed and brought away birds. -- After numerals, too, the sg. is used.

Other animate nouns, chiefly of Prs. origin, have a nom. plur. in -ān: *Parian rētani* the fairies said; *ke i ẓayā bo bandiān bōm* GP if there are many prisoners in a place; *kumōrān rētani* the girls said.

Nouns denoting relationship (*tat* father; *nan* mother; *biār* brother; *ẓār* daughter; *bok* wife; *wau* grandmother, etc.) and also *maristan* 'slave' have nom. plur. in -gini. E. g., *brārgini*.

*Sālar* 'servant' and *lanḡi* 'unfaithful wife' take the nom. plur. suffix -lāk.

*Ẓau* 'son' has a reduplicated nom. plur. *ẓiẓau*.

The obl. plur. suffix is always -ān<sup>6</sup>. E. g.: *Ḥami palō;ān alt* having taken away these apples; *duwarthan wītai* he opened the doors; *pongān te lohtai* GP he looked at the feet; *tan hardiān xāli korār* GP unburden your minds; *ẓeṭtu xar xal šer* GP the eyes have a different taste; *ju biṣir moṣau mārītai* he killed forty men; *tan kyeh'ān m'a te del* give me your sheep; *uḥān sora* on the camels; *boggimān te* to his wives; *ḡayan i ustād asistai* GP the boys had a teacher; *šadarbākan huṣ arer* he informed his servants; *ẓiẓawān lohtai* he looked at his sons.

<sup>4</sup> The only example noted of a local case of an animate noun.

<sup>5</sup> *Ahar* after < \**paṣatāh*, but *nha* < \**paṣat*? Cf. above.

<sup>6</sup> The rules regulating the distribution of forms in -ān and -an are not clear.

Nom. plurals in *-ān* have an obl. in *-ānan*: *H'acirānan*, ministers; *hase pariānan istār*<sup>1</sup> the fairies' horse; *dustānan* GP friends<sup>2</sup>. In the plur. the vocative particle is combined with the obl. E.g., *ēi brārginān* o, brothers; *ē kambaxtān* GP o, miserable ones; *ē yārānan* GP o, friends.

The paradigm of the plural is as follows:

Nom.	<i>ye</i>	<i>daq</i>	<i>pariān</i>	<i>brārgini</i>	<i>šadarbāk</i>	<i>zižan</i>
Obl.	<i>yeān</i>	<i>daqān</i>	<i>pariānan</i>	<i>brārginān</i>	<i>šadarbākān</i>	<i>zižānan</i> .

The other plur. cases are formed by adding postpositions to the obl. Thus, *lētān sum* GP with spades (instr.); *kuteran sora* GP with axes (instr.); *ā mālan sar* GP about thy goods (abl.). This functional equivalence of real cases (of inanimate sing. nouns) and of postpositional expressions (of animate nouns and plurals) is a characteristic feature of *Khovar* declension. The suffixless nom. plur. may go back to *-āh*. The nom. plur. in *-ān* is probably of *Prs.* origin, while the obl. plur. in *-ān* is derived from *Skt. -ānām*. It is very improbable that there is any connection between the *Khovar* forms in *-ānan* and the *Pashto* plur. in *-ānan* (*maḥkānan*, *yārānan*, etc.). More probably it is formed by adding the obl. plur. *-an* to a nom. plur. in *-ān*.

The plur. suffix *-gini* may go back to some derivative of *Skt. gṇa-*. With *zižan* cf. the augmentative reduplication in *hloṭh* (very) big, from *loṭh* big.

**Personal Pronouns.** — Only in the sing. is there any distinction between the nom. and the obl.

<sup>1</sup> But also *pariān sardār* the chief of the fairies.

<sup>2</sup> Note *subūnanan* 'the friends' (in a song) with double *-an*.

<sup>3</sup> O'Brien gives nom. pl. *d'akān* boys, gen. pl. *d'akānā* and Biddulph *istārān* horses, gen. pl. *istārānā*. Acc. to O'Brien the pl. of *an* mountain is *am'ēn* (gen. *am'ēnā*; abl. *am'ēnā*), while the LSI gives the form *amur* as abl. sg. and pl. — The only example given by O'Brien is *māyānā* (gen.) in Sentence 134. In Feroze Din's very unreliable *Hand Book on Chitrali & Gilgiti Languages* (Rawal Pindi & Murree, 1902) we find *ju astoran* two horses; *šarangiāna muktā* service with officers (nom. pl. *šarangiān*); *ghuchāno ruṣhti* eyesight; *lepyāno* of the Levies' (nom. *lepyān*).

	1st Person	2nd Person
Nom. Sing. ....	<i>awa</i>	<i>tā</i>
Obl. Sing. ....	<i>mā</i>	<i>tā</i>
Plur. ....	<i>ɪspa</i>	<i>bisa</i> : <i>pisa</i> .

Pkt. *Ahakam* > Kharoshthi Doc. *ahu* + *a* (from *ma*) > *awa*?  
*Mā* < Aśoka Shahbazg. *maa*; *tā* is probably a secondary form, as it seems likely that *tava* would have resulted in \**tā*. -- *Ispa* < \*(a)*spa*<sup>4</sup> < *asmā(n)*. -- For *bisa* Bloch<sup>5</sup> suggests a derivation from *vah* + \**smat*. This is possible if we assume a dissimilation of \**vasma* > \**vaspa* into \**vasa*<sup>6</sup>.

#### Demonstrative Pronouns:

	This		That (This)		That (He), (The)	
	Subst.	Adj.	Subst.	Adj.	Subst.	Adj.
Nom. Sing.	( <i>halya</i>	( <i>halya</i>	<i>hes</i>	<i>he</i>	( <i>h</i> ) <i>se</i> <sup>4</sup>	( <i>ha</i> ) <i>se</i> <sup>7</sup>
Obl. "	( <i>hahno</i>	"	<i>horo</i>	"	( <i>ha</i> ) <i>toyo</i>	( <i>ha</i> ) <i>te</i> <sup>7</sup>
Abl. "	<i>hamta</i> ; <i>jār</i>	"	"	"	( <i>halla</i> , <i>ār</i>	"
Nom. Plur.	( <i>hahmī</i> )	( <i>hahmī</i>	<i>het</i>	"	( <i>hallet</i>	"
Obl. "	( <i>hahmī'an</i>	"	<i>hetan</i>	"	( <i>halletan</i>	"

The *he*-forms are probably slightly emphatic, but by far not so much as e. g. Pkt. *ham m*, *ham ār*.<sup>8</sup> As a matter of fact, *ya*, *se* and several other simple forms are rare, while *toyo* is quite common. *Te* occurs only in GP *te aḥār* after that, thereupon.

*Hef(s)* is commonly used in contrast with *haya*; but the exact difference between *he(s)* and *hase* is difficult to define from the material available. *Hef(s)* is especially common in oratio directa in the tales.

<sup>1</sup> Boddulph, p. 80, in a song has *ghetchām* eyes (object). -- I have not come across any such forms in my material, nor are they found in the GP or in the LSI.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wakhi, LW from Khawar, *ya* (Indo-Ir. Frontier Languages, II, p. 491).

<sup>3</sup> Indo-Iryan, p. 193.

<sup>4</sup> Or, if Turner, BSOS, V, p. 133, is right in assuming a development *sm* > *spm* > *sp*, of \**haspa* > \**hasa*.

<sup>5</sup> GP, O'Brien, LSI *hasa*, *hala*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. e. g., Shumashū *talle* they, those; Wakhi (*halyem* this, (*halyem* that -- V also Bloch, op. cit., p. 199.

<sup>7</sup> Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap XIV

The distinction between pronominal substantives and adjectives and the reduced inflection of the pronominal adjectives are common to several Dardic languages, such as Pashai, Phalula and Shumashti.

Examples: *Haya hase saibi sūrat asur* this one is the master (portraited person) of the picture; *ya kēā moš asur?* what kind of man is this one? *hamo jawābo tu mo te rā* tell him the answer to this; *hamār aīhe* GP after this; *hamcār žibe* eat of this; *hamit retani* these [men] said; *mit ha honi* these ones have become many; *hamitan khalan gaṇi* having seized both of these ones; *awa mitan žibiko no bōm* I cannot eat these [dishes].

*Haya dardāna* GP this pearl; *haya gurzeno mēwāan* the fruits of this garden; *hami ḍaqan* GP these boys; *mi pulunguṣṭu* these finger-rings.

*Hes jam boi* he will recover (lit. get well); *horo awetām* I took him away; *hetan žibōsi* we will eat them; *het chuṭi paritani* they turned into dust. — *He kambox* GP this branch (nom.); *he uō utār* let him enter into this well; *he sot čidun* those seven kettles.

*Hase hate ṣapik-pačcako dūr birāi* that is that baker's house; *(ha)toṇo te rētam* I said to him; *se tonj hoi* he disappeared; *hataṇār* from that place, time; *taṇār aīhe* GP after that; *hatet ta brārgini asun* they are thy brothers; *tet burtūtani* they got afraid; *(ha)tetan sun* together with them. *Hase mōš* that man; *se pačāl* that shepherd; *hate mošo no pošīar* he did not see that (the) man; *hate ṣak brārgini ha'oṇo hate boko hate istoro sun i kori gaṇi badšō gona baṇāni* those (the) other brothers, having taken that wife of his together with the horse, went near the king; *hate pariānan istor* the lairies' horse.

The derivation of *ya* from *ayam*, *īyam* and of *mo* from *imām*, Pkt. *imassa* is evident. *Mi-(t)* must go back to *ime*, but we should, perhaps, expect \**me*. *Se* probably from NW. Pkt. *se* = *so* (or, if *sa* is the more archaic form, < *sa*?). Obl. sg. *tela* < *tam*, *tat*, while *toṇo* goes back to \**takasya*, cf. Vedic *takā*- this (demin.); Shahbazg. *etakena*. Pl. *te(t)* < *te*.

*H-es* < \**esale*, with *s* for *ṣ* from *sale*, and *horo* (possibly with assimilation from \**ha-ro?*)<sup>1</sup> < *etam*, etc. From *ete* we should expect

<sup>1</sup> Feroze Din has *horo*, but his notation of vowels is inexact in the extreme.

\**er*, or \**re* but it seems possible that also *het* has been influenced by the corresponding form of the *tut*-pronoun:

$$1c \geq 1c \cdot 1c$$

• 151

*etc* > \**ede* > *ete* (with *t* from *te*) = (*h*.)*et*.

From *het* the *-t* was transferred also to *mit* and *let*, while the original forms *mi*, *te* (and analogically *het*, were, for unknown reasons, restricted to the pronominal adjectives.

The same pronominal stems appear also in *ha-mo-š* in this manner, *ha-ra-š* thus; *ha-mu-ni* this much; *(ha)-ru-ni* that much; *(ha)-ya-ra* here; *he-ra*, *(ha)-te-ra* there; *ha-ye-i* here; *he-i*, *ha-tē-i* there. -- Cf. also *ha-nūn* to-day; *(ha)-ni-š(-n)* now; *ha-nyā* at that time.

The Interrogative and Indeterminate Pronom. is *kā*, obl. *kās* (animate); *kya*, obl. *khyo* (inanimate). - *Kos* < *kaśya*, with retention of *sts* in a monosyllabic; but *khyo* < \**kīha* < \**kīya*? Cf. Hind. *kis* animate; *kahi* inanimate, with a similar unexplained difference in the treatment of *ss*.

[Verbs.] — The ancient athematic conjugation has been given up as in all other Modern IA languages. Thus, *asur* he is: \**asati*? But the various thematic stems are still to a large extent kept apart in the aorist-future derived from the ancient present. Khowar distinguishes between aorists in *-um* (*-ium*), *-əm*, *-im*, and *-em*.

1. V-Aorists in *-ṣam* as a type go back to *-am*. E. g. *śiṅham* I learn < *śikṣām*; *laṅgam* I move < *laṅghām*; *añjam* I put on clothes < *a-muñcām*; *pacūr* ripens, is cooked < *\*pacati* < *paçyate*; *briṣum* I die < *mriçvām*; *bercūr* is left behind < *vī-riçyate*; *čhiur* is broken < *\*chid(i)yate*.

11. The aorist in -ām is limited to a small group of verbs. Ancient formations are *korām* I do < *karomī*; *bām* I become < Pali *bhomi* < *bhavāmi*, and possibly *āhām* I eat < \**yu-vaumi*, with dissimilation < \**yuyaumi* (?)<sup>2</sup>. *Dām* 'I give' has been secondarily transferred into this conjugation, and the etymologies of *angām* I bring; *alām* I take away are unknown.

<sup>2</sup> Prob. not < *dsati*. Short *ai* does not result in *o* in present stems.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. below, p. 24. The change of  $r > b$ , as in initial position, is remarkable.



III. Aorists in *-m* go back to *-emi* < *ayāmi*, *-āmi*, and *-iyāmi*. E. g., *marim* I kill < *mārayāmi*; *baḥim* I divide < Pali *\*bhajemi*<sup>1</sup> (Skt. *bhajami*); *darim* I have, hold < *dhārayāmi*; *bim* I go (away) *apemi* < *apāmi*; *burir* melts < *riliyate*. Many verbs in original *-ami* have been transferred into this class, just as is the case in Pkt., etc. Thus, *baṣir* it rains; *parim* I fall down, go to sleep < *patāmi* etc. It is worth noticing that all representatives of the Skt. 9th present class have *-am* in Khowar. Thus, *lrenim* I buy; *hrenim* I shear<sup>2</sup>; *ponim* I winnow; *gaḥim* I take; *ḥanim*, O'Brien *janim*, I know; *binim* (O'Brien *-om*) I knit < Pali < *vināmi* I weave; *manim* I plaster, rub < *mathāmi* (Sinhā *mānci* rubs); *donim* I ponder upon, consider < Pali *dhonāti*, Skt. *dhunoti* to shake, toss (?); *batim* I bind<sup>3</sup>, and, possibly, *chinim* I break, cut, if < *\*chidāmi*<sup>4</sup>. A derivation from the weak forms in *-m*, which had been eliminated already in Pali, is not probable, but the coincidence is remarkable. Note that *r* has been preserved in the monosyllabic *ser* it is < *śete*.

IV. Causatives and Denominatives in *-tim* (Imper. 2nd sing. *-āwā*) are derived from *-āpemi*, Skt. *-āpayāmi*. Thus, e. g., *paṣtim* I show (*paṣim* I see); *biḥtim* I melt (trans.); *drungtim* I stretch out (*drung* long)<sup>5</sup>. Note *dr̥tim* I pour out < *dravayāmi*; *r̥tim* I speak < *\*dravayāmi* (?), *ru-* to roar, make a noise; *l̥tim* I find, obtain; reap < *\*lābhaya'i* and *\*lāvayāmi* (the).

Regarding *-ār* < *-ati* and *-aur* < *-at* v. below.

[Personal Suffixes.] The personal suffixes of the aorist sing. are *-m*, *-s*, *-r* < *-mi*, *-si*, *-ti*. — 1st sing. *-um* must go back to an analogical form *-ami*, not *-āmi*. After *-ḍ-* the 3 sg. suffix is *-i*, not *-r*: *korḍi* he does, *hoi* he becomes. But note imper. 2nd plur. *būr* < *bhavata* and preterite 3rd sing. *hur*, beside *hoi*, he became. The reason for this different treatment of postvocalic *\*ḍ* < *t* is unknown.

The aorist plur. suffixes are *-si*, *-mi*, *-m̐*. The final *-i* distinguishes the plur. as a whole from the sing. and prevents homonymy between

<sup>1</sup> *Bhujhi*, Geiger, *Grammatik des Pali*, § 139.2. — Infin. *munik*, but *boḥik*.

<sup>2</sup> O'Brien, in his *Corrections*, gives *hrenūm*, but I heard *-am*.

<sup>3</sup> If, irregularly, with *t* < *dh*.

<sup>4</sup> Scarcely from Pali *chidāmi*, as *nd* seems to be retained when it has remained intervocalic in Khowar. In Khowar final *nd* has resulted in *-n*, which has been

the 2nd sing. and 1st plur. and between the 1st sing. and the 2nd plur. It is of unknown origin and must be a secondarily added particle.

The 1st plur. goes back to *-m(a)si*, cf., e. g., Pashai *-as*, *-ais* (*-anz*), and the 3rd plur. of course to *-nti*. The derivation of the 2nd plur. is uncertain. Most Dardic and Kafiri forms go back to *-thana*. In early Khowar this suffix ought to have resulted in *\*-ð(a)n*. Is it possible that *\*-ðn* was differentiated into *\*-βn*, from which *-nn > m*?

The aorist is used as an indefinite present and as a future. The real, durative, present is formed by adding *-an* to the aorist forms: *gənim-an* I take, *korəm-an* (*korəny an*) they make, etc. E. g.: *Tu ki bis-an*, *ma kyəhan ka raçhūr?* If you are going, who shall tend my sheep? But *asum* I am, etc., *ser* it is (*seni* they are) and *neki* 'is not' do not take the suffix *-an*.

Imperative: The imperative 2nd sing. ends in *-(h)*: *march* kill; *çine(h)* break. This termination, which goes back to Pkt. *-chi* < *\*ayahi*, has been transferred also to verbs in *-am* and *-om*, e. g., *briye* die, *angye(h)* bring<sup>6</sup>. Verbs in *-ām*, *-tim* have *-awe(h)*, *-āwe(h)*: *burtawer* fear; *pašawer* show < *\*əpaya(hi)*. An altogether irregular form is *de* give, probably < *daddhi*.

The 2nd sing. aorists *bas* and *alās* are used as imperatives, 'be', 'take', and no separate imperative forms exist.

The 2nd plur. imperative of verbs in *-im* and *-um* take the suffix *-ūr* < *-ata*. Thus, *gan'ūr* seize; *mārūr* kill; *dosūr* seize (aor. *dasim*); *bojur* go (away)<sup>7</sup>, *bryār* die. Verbs in *-om* have *-or*, e. g., *bōr* < *bhavata*, but *korūr* do < *\*karuta* has preserved the ancient ending of the Skt. 8th class. Verbs in *-tim* have a 2nd plur. imperative in *-awer*, GP *-aur*: *pašawer* show.

The aorist 1st plur. in *-si* is used also for the imperative, while the imper. 3rd sing. and plur. in *-ar*, *-āni* have been taken over from the

transferred also to inflected forms, e. g., in *fon* road, loc. *fonī*, but *fondi* GP proximus < *\*panthaka*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *beçim* I win, *braxim* I knock; Yulgha (< Khowar) *buçim*, *braxim* < *\*awim*.

<sup>7</sup> *Kne(h)* and *ko* 'do', just as *korim* and *kum*.

<sup>8</sup> From the past stem.

ancient subjunctive. Thus, *briyār* 'let him die' < *mriyāti*<sup>1</sup>; *gaṇāni* 'let them take'. But *diyār* 'let him give' is probably derived from the imperative *dadātu*, and the contamination with this form has probably helped to preserve the ancient subjunctive forms.

[Subjunctive] — The actual Khow. subjunctive is characterized by the infix *-es-*. The inflection given by O'Brien, LSI and GP is: *-esam*; *-esū*; *-esīr*; *-esam*; *-esimī*; *-esimī*, but my informant from the Terich valley gave *-esān* for the 1st sing.<sup>2</sup> It seems very unlikely that *-m*, which is the regular 1st sing. ending in all other forms, should have been changed into *-n* in this single case. On the other hand, a 1st sing. in *-n* would be an aberrant form which could easily have been replaced by *-m* in most dialects in order to conform to the general inflectional system. We are therefore, I believe, entitled to consider *-n* as being the original Khowar form, and as going back to the ancient 1st sing. subjunctive in *-ant*. The suffixes of the 2nd sing. and the 1st plur. are the same, originally secondary ones, which we find also in the preterite<sup>3</sup>.

The infix *-es-* cannot be derived from *-iṣya-*, which would not have resulted in a dental *s*. Besides, it is semantically improbable that the future should have been used in conditional clauses. We may perhaps venture the suggestion that the Khowar subjunctive is based upon the ancient optative. After the loss of final consonants Skt. *-eh* and *-et* coalesced in Middle IA *-e*, and this form was extended also to other persons<sup>4</sup>. Such insufficiently characterized forms may subsequently have been reinforced by the addition of the optative of the auxiliary: *\*kare + \*siyāni > kore-ān*; *\*kare-siyati > koresīr*, etc.<sup>5</sup> The details of the phonetical development are obscure.

The conditional and hypothetical force of the subjunctive will appear from the following examples: *Agar l'oyo l'āo kār koresū, j'am bes'ir*. *Dua'arho tax'tisū, awa h'nś k'oresān, k'ara h'ai, tan zap'an anjesān, ḥh'an n'o bes'an* if thou hadst listened (lit.: made the ear)

<sup>1</sup> Note *hai*, not *\*hār*, let it be.

<sup>2</sup> The 1st plur. does not occur in my texts. The other forms agree with those given by O'Brien, etc. — From my other informants I did not take down any subjunctive forms.

<sup>3</sup> V. below, p. 23 sq.

to his word, it would have been well. If thou hadst knocked at the door, I should have understood who was coming, I should have put on my rags [and] should not have been naked; *ke avel huš koresam, the xā ma-xā ilāj asqānio sora bi-šir* GP if I had only understood it at the first, it is highly probable that some remedy could have been easily devised [for it] then.

**Preterite.** — The regular type is: I took:

	Sing.	Plur.
1st Pers.	<i>gaṇ-ist-am</i>	<i>gaṇ-ist-ām</i>
2nd "	<i>ist-au</i>	<i>ist-ami</i>
3rd "	<i>ist-ai</i>	<i>ist-am</i>

Irregular verbs:

	I went		I did	
	Sing.	Plur.	Sing.	Plur.
1st Pers.	<i>baṇ-est-am</i>	<i>baṇ-est-am</i>	<i>ar-est-am</i>	<i>ar-est-ām</i>
2nd "	<i>au</i>	<i>est-ami</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>est-ami</i>
3rd "	<i>ai</i>	<i>ami</i>	<i>er</i>	<i>eni</i>

While the 1st sing. and 3rd plur. (and 2nd plur. ?) go back to ancient primary endings transferred to the preterite, the 1st plur. *-m-est-āma* shows that this tense is derived from a true ancient preterite, a type not preserved in any other modern IA language, with the exception of the neighbouring Kalasha.

Also the contrast between the 3rd sing. preter. in *-ai* and the present in *-r* may have some connection with the ancient distribution of primary and secondary personal suffixes, although it is not possible to derive *-ai* directly from any Old IA form. Nor do we know why *-r* appears in *arer* and also in *hōr* 'became', an alternative form of *hoi*. Also the 2nd sing. *-(a)u* is distinguished from the present, but I am unable to suggest any derivation of this suffix<sup>6</sup>. The 1st plur.

<sup>6</sup> Thus Pali 1st-3rd sing. *-e* (beside *-eyyāmi*, *-eyyāmi*, etc.), Pkt. 1st-3rd sing. 3rd plur. *-e*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the amalgamation of two inflected verbal forms e. g. in the Yidgha imperfect *šim-stam* I was beating; *šit-stat* thou wast beating, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Or, possibly, 2 sg. *-ayā* > *-au*; 3 sg. *-ayāt* > *-ai*?

contains no *-i*. Apparently it was of greater importance to distinguish this form from the 2nd plur. than from the 1st sing.

The origin of the infix *ist* and the reason for its absence in some persons of the irregular verbs are unknown<sup>1</sup>. In some varieties of Khowar the *s* has been dropped, and I heard e. g. *gapitam* 'I took'; *as(i)tam* 'I was' from all my informants.

A few verbs have preserved the augment. The most interesting form is *ośai* it was < *aśyat*. But we also find *obestam* I could; *obristam* I died; *očustam* I was broken; *(o)llestam* I found; *(o)trēstam* I said. Also *arestam* 'I did' probably contains the augment, *a-larayam* > *\*a;ar* > *ar-*, with irregular loss of *-r*? Cf. Kalasha *aris* 'I did'. It is also possible that *oyo-stam* 'I ate' goes back to *\*a-yau-*, cf. *ēilom* I eat<sup>2</sup> — Kalasha *ēim:āsis*, *Katiyu-*, etc. — Skt. *yauti* takes hold of<sup>3</sup>; mixes, blends; *sam-yu-* to devour (cf. also *yūy-*, *yara-*, *yirasa-*?). There is no reason why we should, with Bloch<sup>4</sup>, take the 'augment' to be a secondary formation in Khowar and Kalasha. It is difficult to see how such a mimicry of the ancient augment should have arisen.

Other irregular verbs, partly with suppletive inflection, are:

	Infinitive	Aorist	Pret.	
			1st sing. 3rd sing.	
<i>luk</i> to become	<i>bōm</i>	<i>hostam</i>	<i>hūi, hūr</i>	< <i>bhacāmi</i> , Kal. <i>bām:hāwis</i>
<i>lik</i> to go	<i>bim</i>	<i>ba;estam</i>	<i>bayai</i>	< <i>apaimi: afa-ga(ta)-?</i>
<i>gk</i> to come	<i>gōm</i>	<i>hastam</i>	<i>hai</i>	Kal. <i>im:a</i> (< <i>āyam</i> ).
<i>dik</i> to give	<i>dōm</i>	<i>phrestam</i>	<i>prai</i>	< <i>dā: pra-dā-</i> , Kal. <i>dēm: pra.</i>
<i>angik</i> to bring	<i>angām</i>	<i>ahstam</i>	<i>alai</i>	
<i>alk</i> to take away	<i>alom</i>	<i>awestam</i>	<i>awai</i>	<i>awai</i> < <i>aṣṭā, al?</i> (but cf. <i>bayai</i> ).
<i>nišik</i> to sit down	<i>nišim</i>	<i>nišestam</i>	<i>nišai</i>	< <i>nī šid-</i> , but note <i>š</i> . Poss. < <i>nī-si?</i>
<i>nišik</i> to rise, come out	<i>nišim</i>	<i>nišestam</i>	<i>nišai</i>	

<sup>1</sup> It has been borrowed by the Werchikwar dialect of Burushaski, v. Lorimer, *The Burushaski Language*, I, § 536.

<sup>2</sup> One informant, who spoke a kind of debased *bazar*-lang, gave the regularized *loritam* as an equivalent of *aritam*.

<sup>3</sup> V. Turner, *BSOS*, IV, p. 539.

From the root *b-* 'to become' is formed a preterite *birestan*, *bir'au*, *bir'ai*, , , *bir'ani*. According to O'Brien *birai* is equivalent to *biti asum* 'I have become' and is commonly used in connection with the past ptc. in *-irā*, *-irdu* and with the noun of agency in *-ak*. E. g., *k'ardu birai* he has done; *mšik birai* he is sitting. -- In my texts and in the GP these forms are, however, used also in other combinations. Thus: *I m'ōš bir'ai*, *M'ōšo trai ži'au astani*, *B'iko ži'au Pāy bir'ai*. There was a man. The man had three sons. Then one son was (had become?) bald-headed; *i badšā astai, halošo sot ži'au biranilastani* there was a king; he had seven sons; *i pādšā žau astai, i pādšā žuro te ašeq birai* there was a prince; he was (had become?) the lover of a [certain] princess; *astai no astai, birai no birai, i fāšā birai* it was and it was not, it happened and it did not happen; there was a king; *aor parānu loq birani* GP the rest was old rags; *jai kulūm birai, āy bo birai* GP the stream was deep, and there was much water [in it].

A parallel preterite from the root *š-* 'to be' (inanimate) is *širai*. *Nojoro lohtai, jam nojor birai, daulat boh širai* he looked at the castle: it was a good castle and there was a great treasure [in it]; *poma i dūr širai* on the road there was a house.

Note that *ošof/slām* is also used with animate subjects: *Awa juwān asilāmlošotām* I was a young man; *ma tat pādšā ošai* . . . *awa pādšā žau asitām* my father was a king, . . . I was the king's son.

The Habitual Past which occurs only in the 3rd pers., is formed with *-iawur* (*-ōawur*), GP *-aur*; *-āawuri*, GP *-auri*. E. g. *koraur* he used to do, he would do; *žibāuri* they used to eat. I am unable to trace this form back to any ancient prototype.

Finally there occurs in the GP a form *šūr*: *Quwatino te šūr ke* it behoves (Pšht. *šāyi*) the strong that [he should, etc.]. Phonetically it might be a present of the type \**šiyate*.

\* V. above, p. 19.

\* Uhlenbeck, IF. 25.

\* Lindo-aryen, p. 237. But cf. Turner, loc. cit.

\* Only the 3rd sing. occurs in the material at my disposal.

\* But also e. g. *daulat ma boh ošai* I had great riches.

All other past tenses are based upon various participles.

Perfect: *Kori asim* I have done.

First Pluperfect: *Kori asistam* I had done. -- This form is not mentioned by O'Brien, it is comparatively rare in my texts, but quite frequent in the GP. E. g. *niši asitam* I had sat down (Prs. *šišta būdam*); *angiti astam* - *angir'u oštam* I had brought; *diti astai* GP he had given. There seems to be no difference of use between this form and the:

Second Pluperfect: *Kārdū ošotām* I had done. E. g. *gīrū ošoni* they had come; *rārdū ošau* hadst thou spoken?

Third Pluperfect: *Kardū bircām*. -- E. g., *boḡdū birani*, *ačū hāni* they had gone away, [but] came back; *toḡo pušūr ūḡ birū birai* GP his flesh had dwindled away (lit. become water); *tu rārdū birau?* GP didst thou say? (Pst. pluperfect); *bečūru birani* GP they were (had been?) left. This form is probably used as a resultative, denoting rather the state resulting from an action than the action itself.

It is not mentioned by O'Brien.

First Imperfect: *Koran ošotām* (*korān oštam*, *korocištam*) I was doing.

Second Imperfect: *Koran asistam*. This form, which is not mentioned by O'Brien, is of rare occurrence.

Third Imperfect: *Koran hostam*. I have only come across one example of this form: *Yōr no žanau hotām*, *yōr huš no koran ho'am* I did not know [any] sun, I was not aware of [any] sun (lit. I did not become knowing, etc.?). -- Ingressive?

Habitual Imperfect(?): *Korak bircām* lit. 'I was a doer'.

E. g. *letam marak birai* he used kill them (Prs. *ūrā mēkušt*); *žibak birai* he used to eat them.

The noun of agency in *-ak* may also be combined with *hostam*. E. g., *pādšā čangak hotam* I deceived (lit. became a deceiver of) the king.

The system of compound tenses in Khovar is thus much more elastic than that given by O'Brien and in the LSI, (Perf. *g'ani-as'im*; Imperf. *gana'oštam*; Pluperf. *ganir'u-oštam*), and it includes several

<sup>1</sup> V. below.

<sup>2</sup> But *re* having said < *re*, etc.

combinations not mentioned in these sources. In some cases the compound tenses have been phonetically amalgamated.

Finally the Perfect Ptc. is used as a finite verb, 3rd sing. and plur. E. g.: *I won astai, i lap astai. Tetan angār boḍdū. Diga angār no lardu. Chui biko dudṛi ēa; ā zoma angār nōitai* (or: *māliṃ bōū*) there was an old woman and an old man. Their fire went out. They found no other fire. When night fell a fire appeared in a far-off place, on a mountain; *angāro ēi; ā toritūtoritai* he reached the place of the fire. In some, but not all cases the subject is put in the oblique case: *Bāpo rārdū* the old man said (lit.: *senis dictum?*).

The following participles and nominal forms of the verb have been noted:

[I.] The Absolutive in *-i, -ti*. Most verbs have *-i*, thus *kori, gapi, bi* having gone<sup>3</sup>. But several of the most common, irregular verbs have *-ti*. E. g., *giti* having come; *angiti* having brought; *diti* having given; *biti* having become; *ēuti* having eaten; *alti* having taken away; *birti* (with *b* from *bri- mri-*) having died.

The absolutive goes back to *-(i)ya*, Pkt. *-ia*, and to *\*-tuya*, Ved. *-trī*; Shabdarz. *-ti* (°-thi).

[II.] The Perfect Participle in *-(r)ū, -(r)dū*. Regular forms are *gapiṃ; d-rū; angirū*, etc. With *-rū; bārdū; zurdū; bōrdū* dead; *rārdū* said; *lārdū* found, and with *-dū; boḍdū* gone; *aloū* taken away.

This participle is derived from *-itaka*, etc., e. g., *dirū < \*ditaka*; *kārdū < \*kāritaka?*; *boḍdū < apa-gataka*. *Zurdū* and several other forms are analogical.

The perfect ptc. is also used as a noun. Thus, *birdū* corpse, dead person; *bhēirū* leavings; *kārdū* created being<sup>4</sup>; *ažirū* children, etc.

[Present Participle] in *-aṃ(a)*. — It is used in the formation of the imperfect and as an independent participle. — *Boḍawa fikr korau oṣoi* GP [as he was] going along he was thinking; *haya har anuso hayara gyan xausir-an* this one, coming here every day, makes a request. — A derivation from *-am-* is improbable.

<sup>3</sup> With early syncope, before *-t* resulting in *r*.

<sup>4</sup> *Aha di tā puda lārdū asun, we hanṭan d puda kori asun* GP I am also one of thy creatures, and these too hast thou created.



[IV.] Noun of Agency in *-iḥak*. -- *Korak* actor; *mārak* murderer; *angyak* bringer; *ṣapik-pačiak* baker.

[V.] Infinitive in *-ik* (*čik*, *-āik*). -- *Korik* to do; *pačēik* to cook; *burūik* to fear. -- The infinitive is case-inflected, and forms in *-o*, *-a* and *-ār* occur; but I have not come across any in *-i* or *-en*.

Infinitives in *-k* are found also in Kalasha, Shina and other Dardic languages.

[VI.] Passive Participle in *-in*. -- *Fečān sora pošin boi* GP with our eyes we see (lit.: with the eyes it becomes seen); *balenjin bīi* [the rugs] having been spread out; *roān sar judā pchēin bīi asus* GP thou liest (lit.: hast been placed) apart from [other] folk.

Cf. the Sindhi Fut. Pass. Ptc. in *-iṇo*?

[VII.] There are also some verbal nouns, e. g., a noun of instrument in *-iṇi*: *maṣiṇi* broom (*maṣ-* to sweep); *kiṣiṇi* plough.

Khovar has built up a new inflectional system, widely different from the Sanskritic one. But to a larger extent than perhaps any other modern IA language it has, in its relative isolation, utilized material handed down from a remote antiquity for the new structure. It is therefore of great importance for our understanding of the evolution of Indo-Aryan.